

Article

# Knowledge Management Practices as an Opportunity for the Achievement of Sustainable Development in Social Enterprises of Medellín (Colombia)

Natalia Marulanda-Grisales <sup>1,\*</sup> , José Julián Herrera-Pulgarín <sup>2</sup>  and María Lucelly Urrego-Marín <sup>1</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Administrative, Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios—UNIMINUTO, Bogotá 111021, Colombia; murregomari@uniminuto.edu.co

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios—UNIMINUTO, Bogotá 111021, Colombia; jherreraful@uniminuto.edu.co

\* Correspondence: nmarulandag@uniminuto.edu.co

**Abstract:** In the context of the city of Medellín (Colombia), which has been declared a National Science, Technology, and Innovation District, Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs) have been gaining importance because they improve the commercial entrepreneurial ecosystem by articulating tacit and explicit knowledge. The study investigates the role of KMPs in Social Entrepreneurship (SE), and how this relationship generates products and services that meet social needs, with articulation between tacit and explicit knowledge, which start from the experiences of entrepreneurs and join shared interests in ecosystems and public policies of social entrepreneurship. This study employs a non-experimental design based on a survey and a deep interview for 40 SE initiatives; we then developed a Pearson's bivariate correlation review and a narrative design. The results reveal that SE initiatives aimed at novel market niches and management strategies that articulate multiple sectors and social actors that aim for a practical scope of the purposes of entrepreneurship concerning the 2030 Agenda of the United Nations. The findings of this study suggest that KMPs in SE create a series of perspectives that seek to achieve greater competitiveness and sustainability in front of the market, all from innovative proposals of social value articulated with environmental care.

**Keywords:** entrepreneurship ecosystems; knowledge management; sustainable development; social entrepreneurship



**Citation:** Marulanda-Grisales, N.; Herrera-Pulgarín, J.J.; Urrego-Marín, M.L. Knowledge Management Practices as an Opportunity for the Achievement of Sustainable Development in Social Enterprises of Medellín (Colombia). *Sustainability* **2024**, *16*, 1170. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031170>

Academic Editors: Antonio Botti and Massimiliano Vesci

Received: 16 May 2023

Revised: 21 June 2023

Accepted: 26 June 2023

Published: 30 January 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Within the framework of emerging and entrepreneurial organizations which seek to meet or create requirements in market segments for different economic sectors, Social Enterprises (SEs) seek to innovate in business models, offering alternatives to environmental, social, and financial problems [1]. These innovations are obtained from collaborative and shared strategies between social organizations and communities, managing to re-signify the sense of value creation [2] in addition to improving the conditions for shareholders, consumers, and communities involved. SEs are part of a phenomenon that is developing globally, which is gaining recognition and regulation by national governments; in addition, it is being considered as the economic sector that allows the energizing of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, aimed at solving social problems by solution markers or business initiative makers [1–3].

As a field of research approach under construction, the area of SE was consolidated in the 1990s, based on a vast academic output nourished with critical aspects of the experiences of both entrepreneurs and the ecosystems in which they operate [4,5]. It can also be grouped and studied to provide similar subjects and experiences [6]. Among these aspects are Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs), which involve elements capable of creating, storing, transferring, and applying knowledge to generate value among the different

stakeholders of organizations [7]. They relate to critical variables of market intelligence to develop new products, businesses, and strategic alliances [8] that meet consumers' present and future needs [9].

Concerning the SEs, the KMPs start by strengthening the skills and experiences of the collaborators [10] to improve their agility and efficiency in the decision-making process, increasing their performance and ensuring the achievement of organizational goals [11], and the constant search for new knowledge resources from the various ecosystems [12]. In this sense, it is necessary to characterize the KMPs used by SE initiatives and their contribution to the integral development of the context and the global perspective in which they are generated. The chosen scenario is the city of Medellín (Colombia), the first Science, Technology, and Innovation District in the country; which has a Public Policy on SEs, from work in sectors such as environment, peace, human rights, education, and the economy, as well as a gender perspective from the integration of entrepreneurs and income towards women. It offers an ecosystem characterized by the active participation of civil society and is decentralized and dynamic, with challenges that include the legal recognition of the business model and the financing, training, and generation of synergies which seek to increase productivity and solve city problems by the promotion of equity and equality of approach to new benefits and better social conditions [13]. The combination of public, private, and community resources has allowed the city's renewal to strengthen social integration, organizational creativity and inclusion of various economic sectors in entrepreneurship processes, generating a positive impact on society [14].

The approach from the specific perspective of the KMPs in this study establishes a contribution to the field of knowledge in SE's thematic and methodological domains. First, although the SE is not conceptually or thematically delimited, current research trends characterize them from ethical, social, and social hybridization aspects [15]. In this sense, the initiatives addressed focus on the mood of their creators, the interest in social transformation towards the communities involved, and the appropriate management of intangible capital from the typology of companies that represent them [16]; all this, from the less-referenced market niches in the literature, such as mental health and sports management, to renowned others such as education and the environment. As part of the SE ecosystem of Medellín, the associated KMPs energize the promotion and creation of products and services aimed at improving social conditions and respect for the environment [17] that result in profitable, efficient, and flexible business opportunities when transmitting benefits to communities; the management of resources and exchange of experiences; and access to collaborative networks in the early stages of organizational maturity [10].

When considering the methodological aspect, using Pearson's bivariate correlation coefficient makes it possible to associate the strength and degree of relationship between variables of interest [18]: measures from specific categories such as Social Entrepreneurship, Knowledge Management Practices, organizational aspects, and development. To this extent, although the upward direction of scientific publications in databases on the independently studied variables is relevant—with a predominance in Europe, where there is a more significant number of associated institutions and researchers—there are few studies that address the tripartite relationship between them [19–21].

In this sense, the purpose of the current study is to analyze the effect of the KMPs on the SE and its contribution to the development of products and services that meet social needs without jeopardizing the creation of value for organizations. The text has four sections: the Theoretical Framework of Social Entrepreneurship; Knowledge Management Practices; Organizational Aspects; and Development. Then, we describe the development of a mixed methodology, with a non-experimental design, based on Pearson's bivariate correlation review and a narrative design: 40 SE initiatives of the city of Medellín were approached for convenience for research; 30 through surveys and the remaining ten from in-depth interviews. Finally, the document presents an analysis of research findings.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### 2.1. Social Entrepreneurship

SE seeks to articulate own knowledge with new knowledge, to explore opportunities and solutions to social problems [22]. The diversity of studies on SE range over a number of topics that allow them to be grouped. For the KMPs, the subcategories are taken as: suggested taxonomies of enterprises and the typologies of their implementers; the economic model to which they are accepted, a description of the level of maturity of the social enterprise; and entrepreneurship ecosystems. In the case of taxonomies, groupings are included based on general elements, human resources, business strategy and value creation, and challenges faced and innovation [23]. In addition, from the contribution of the SE to rural and community development and urbanization, there are groupings on the social, economic and environmental considerations of social entrepreneurs; financing and crowdfunding patterns; and women entrepreneurs, in addition to the corporate social responsibility carried out by the SE for existing and potential researchers in the field [24].

On the other hand, the typologies of entrepreneurs are based on the existing organizations or aspects of their creators as agents of social change, depending on the nature of their lives, professional experiences, and the scope of their social commitment [25]. Respect for economic models is circular, focused on the reuse of resources during the production process, ensuring the preservation of systemic social and ecological systems [26]. The Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) promotes the democratization of economic activity, with social revenues beyond the exclusively monetary [27]. The green economy is where eco-entrepreneurs look for business opportunities by using resources and favoring the environment while generating or supporting both profitable and efficient products and services [28]. The maturity of the SE is related to the efficiency of the knowledge management process, the training of entrepreneurs, and the way of managing the associated resources [29], since entrepreneurs must mobilize their individual and social skills to integrate contributions from complementary actors or new capital [30], decreasing risks in the development of a new product or service to expand market share [31].

SE ecosystems correspond to the community of actors that interact and depend on each other to meet their objectives and generate synergies and circles of interrelation, interdependence, and complementarity [32]; taking creativity and innovation as references, these tools guarantee the pragmatism of their operations, given their flexibility and adaptability [33]. They can vary depending on culture, expectations, and institutional pressures [34], given their composition of at least six elements [35]: accessibility to various markets; the talent of human capital and the labor force; diversity in sources of financing; the existence of support mechanisms; cultural support; and a governmental and regulatory framework, which helps to boost SE from financial, innovative, and training aspects [36].

### 2.2. Knowledge Management Practices

KMPs involve a set of data, information and knowledge which contribute to creating value and competitive advantage in organizations [37], improving their performance and position in highly dynamic markets [38]. In turn, they promote problem-solving and decision-making based on identifying strategic intangible assets [34]; among those that stand out are: technology, identity, brand, reputation, identity, skills, and the experience of employees [39].

Concerning the SE, reviewing the KMPs from specific subcategories such as knowledge transfer, knowledge co-creation, knowledge combination, and value creation is convenient. The first involves building relationships and trust between various stakeholders to develop activities and projects together [34], in addition to the generation, standardization, and compliance of confidentiality agreements that protect intellectual property shared and exploited among various stakeholders. It represents an alternative to favor the creation of sustained competitive advantages between the parties involved [40] through exchanging knowledge in favor of product differentiation [41]. For its part, knowledge co-creation is responsible for evaluating the relationship between consumers and services that organizations offer,

as collaborators have to gather, analyze, interpret, and reconfigure the knowledge that is contributed by the consumer [42]. It is essential to provide stakeholders with knowledge, perceptions, and skills on developing new business models [43], expressing the joint construction of knowledge for adequate service provision and the generation of products that respond to the consumer's needs. It involves the use of cognitive and technological factors to foster collective creativity between two or more individuals who may or may not belong to the same stakeholder group [44], responding to changes in global markets that demand work and collective commitment among stakeholders [45].

Something similar happens with the combination of knowledge, where contextual information can be constantly updated to generate innovation spaces and manage risk in organizations [34]; therefore, explicit knowledge becomes a more complex and systemic component for creating new knowledge inside and outside the organization [46]. It involves the articulation of existing resources that shape customer service outcomes, improve performance, and contribute to the overall competitive ability of organizations [47]; therefore, it is essential at an organizational level to design mechanisms to relate experience, skills, and capabilities between stakeholders [8]. In the same vein, the creation of value goes beyond the profits obtained by shareholders and involves the different stakeholders, such as customers, suppliers, and employees [48]. Social value can be understood from three perspectives: financial, described as the increase in the wealth of shareholders, which represents an increase in corporate profits or the price of shares; social, which involves a set of practices and activities aimed at strengthening the mission of organizations, without disassociating from the financial perspective of the organization [49]; and politics, since government provisions can produce asymmetric benefits in the economy, where various typologies of organizations face multiple obstacles to the exercise of their economic activity [50].

### 2.3. Organizational Aspects

Given the organizational nature of the SE, aspects of the administrative and functional structure are required, in this case, from subcategories such as planning processes, access to financing sources, management of tangible and intangible resources, and incorporation of technologies. Planning is one of the differentiating tools of change that seeks to achieve the most excellent organizational efficiency in environments of uncertainty [51]; at the same time, it allows us to efficiently deliver products, components, and materials that are highly useful for businesses, consumers, and society in general [52]. From access to financing sources, decisions can come from own capital or external sources [53]; in this regard, it is necessary to form in entrepreneurs a set of competencies that will help them identify investment risks and opportunities for cooperation with potential partners [54]. In this way, the SE can attract financial resources for the joint development of projects in which shared value is created and different stakeholders benefit [55].

Concerning the management of tangible and intangible resources, these assets can be seen as a system of variables in which different organizational elements of strategic, physical, financial, human, and relational typology interact [47], which allows estimation of the value of a resource in the market to the deal, in addition to its difference, originality, and necessity [56,57]. In the early stages of consolidation, SEs face a set of barriers to acquiring tangible and intangible resources; therefore, the decisions made in this regard will affect the success of the SE in the market [58].

For its part, incorporating technologies in SE provides opportunities and generates competitive advantages since it facilitates greater integration between this type of organization and stakeholders' requirements; in addition, it reduces uncertainty in the ecosystems to which they belong [59]. Currently, there is a new phenomenon called digital or technology-based SE, which is the result of collaboration between different agents such as governments, universities, companies, and communities, whose purpose is focused on the development of intensive initiatives for the development and adoption of innovations that improve social conditions [60].

#### 2.4. Development

The KMPs in SE promote the active participation of organizations and stakeholders in the joint development of products and services [61] which seek to improve communities' quality of life. In this way, the development concept is approached from three subcategories: organizational development, social development, and its relationship with the 2030 Agenda. The first is related to the performance and fulfilment of strategic objectives regarding cash flow, financial planning, and quality of products and services offered to the consumer [62]. It promotes the innovation of products and services, strengthening organizational flexibility to meet the different requirements of the target market [63] and generates both financial performance (focused on improving the return on investment, in-creasing market share and obtaining a better cash flow) and non-financial performance; for its part, non-financial performance involves compliance with consumer specifications, consumer satisfaction, and employee commitment [64].

Similarly, social development, related to the previous category, evidences the empowerment of collaborators and communities in the reduction of social inequality [65]; at the same time, it favors the consolidation of the organizational structure, acquisition of technology and renewal of information systems, access to promoters, and knowledge allies. The active involvement of those involved in the SE leads to identifying the priorities, characteristics, roles, and commitment of the participants [66] and promotes interdisciplinary work between various areas of knowledge and expertise [22], in addition to strengthening the consolidation of learning curves between the parties involved [8]. The shared or social value that SEs provide concerning local and regional development can complement the lack of public services, strengthen social capital from volunteering [67], and attend to multiple fronts of the public agenda, while the conditions of institutional and social capital are guaranteed [68].

The KMPs in SE are also related to achieving the 2030 Agenda, especially in developing countries, where they seek to solve their challenges, starting with poverty reduction [24]. However, there is a lack of clarity on how this relationship can occur, given the number of SDGs (17) and the number of targets they group (169), compared to the vast number of types of SE that exist [69]. Faced with this, an alternative lies in directly linking to the breadth of the SE value chain and the number of SDGs they may impact. Based on the above, from the perspective of the KMPs in the SE, the two SDGs that directly point to this are: number eight, which seeks to promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all; in addition to number nine, which aims to build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and encourage innovation. From these two objectives, others can be included indirectly, as other studies do [70]; and, in line with the types of value created by SE, these are: objective one, to reduce poverty; objective three, for the achievement of health and well-being; objective 10, for generating equality; objective 12, with which responsible production and consumption are favored; and objective 17, which establishes synergies for the scope of the Agenda as such.

Based on the previous conceptual approach to these categories, in addition to previous bibliometric and scientometric reviews carried out by the research team [71], the following study subcategories emerge (see Table 1):

**Table 1.** Coding components.

Category	Components (Subcategories)	Coding Concerning the Number of Assertions
Social Entrepreneurship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taxonomies of entrepreneurship</li> <li>• Typologies of the filmmakers</li> <li>• Economic model</li> <li>• Level of maturity of ecosystems</li> </ul>	SE1, SE2, SE3, SE4, SE5, SE6, SE7, SE8, SE9, SE10, SE11, SE12



Table 1. Cont.

Category	Components (Subcategories)	Coding Concerning the Number of Assertions
Knowledge Management Practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge transfer</li> <li>• Co-creation of knowledge</li> <li>• Combination of knowledge</li> <li>• Value creation</li> </ul>	KMPs1, KMPs2, KMPs3, KMPs4, KMPs5, KMPs6, KMPs7, KMPs8, KMPs9, KMPs10, KMPs11, KMPs12, KMPs13, KMPs14, KMPs15, KMPs16
Organizational Aspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning processes</li> <li>• Sources of funding</li> <li>• Management of tangible and intangible resources</li> <li>• Incorporation of technologies</li> </ul>	OA1, OA2, OA3, OA4, OA5, OA6, OA7, OA8, OA9, OA10, OA11, OA12, OA13, OA14, OA15, OA16
Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organizational development</li> <li>• Social development</li> <li>• Relationship with the 2030 Agenda</li> </ul>	D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10, D11, D12, D13

### 3. Materials and Methods

The methodology used was mixed, with a descriptive correlational scope to respond to the four fundamental categories: Social Entrepreneurship, Knowledge Management Practices, Organizational Aspects, and Development. The quantitative approach included a non-experimental design, which resorted to a case study with 40 SEs located in the Metropolitan Area of the Aburrá Valley, selected utilizing non-probabilistic sampling for convenience due to the absence of systematized information about formalized SEs in the city. Given this, data from significant initiatives were used. These data were provided by the city's innovation hub, a partner organization, and an SE accelerator. The selected SEs shared the following characteristics: between three and six years of its creation; managerial leadership of its entrepreneurs; small and medium businesses; and cooperative financing and commercialization of their own services and/or products. Through the design and application of an online form, we sought to measure the attitudes of the leaders of the SEs regarding the KMPs in their organizations. The document was divided into four components according to the four categories of study, including initial aspects of characterization of the SE. Through the use of a Likert Scale, a series of statements were proposed, based on the different subcategories mentioned in the theoretical section, so that they were evaluated in this way: 1, "nothing in agreement"; 5, "completely agree" (See Appendices A and B). Based on the conceptual approach of the previous section, in addition to earlier bibliometric and scientometric reviews carried out by the research team [71], the following study subcategories emerged (see Table 1).

Subsequently, a statistical analysis of the components was carried out using Pearson's bivariate linear correlation. This type of correlation allows for the study of the association capacity and linearity between the variables, which vary between  $-1$  and  $+1$ , indicating negative and positive relationships [72]. In turn, the strength of the correlation can be classified as weak if it varies between 0.10 and 0.30, moderate when behaving between 0.31 and 0.50, and strong if it reaches values above 0.51 [73].

The following pairs of hypotheses were used to identify the significance of the correlation:

$$H_0 = r_{ij} = 0 \text{ vs. } H_a = r_{ij} \neq 0 \quad (1)$$

$$H_0 = \rho = 0 \text{ vs. } H_a = \rho \neq 0 \quad (2)$$

In verifying the significance of the relationship, an  $\alpha = 0.05$  and a confidence level of 95% were used. In the case of obtaining a  $p$ -value  $\leq 0.05$ , the null hypothesis was rejected, obtaining a correlation index significantly different from zero (0).

From the qualitative approach, the design was narrative, as it allowed social entrepreneurs to communicate the KMPs in their organizations; at the same time, it led the researchers in the construction of an objective knowledge about the subject of study [74].

Ten SEs were selected for the convenience of the study and under two criteria: the areas of entrepreneurship more prominent in the region, such as environment, education, the orange economy, and mental health; and the databases provided by official organizations, incubators and pulling ventures, both private and mixed. In-depth interviews were applied to the entrepreneurs in each organization, which were processed in the Atlas Ti 23 software; the significant aspects were analyzed from matrices where the four study categories were saturated with their respective subcategories, providing favorable elements to complement the quantitative findings. The articulation of the results of the survey with the interviews was given from triangulation as a mixed method modality. This method emphasizes the corroboration of both types of data from coincidences and equivalences [75].

The two methodologies used complement each other as follows (see Table 2):

**Table 2.** Methodologies articulation.

Methodology	Aim	Tool	Sample	Sampling	Methodologies Articulation
Quantitative	Significant aspects of KMPs	Survey	30	Non-probabilistic	• Triangulation
Qualitative	Social Entrepreneur narratives	Deep interview	10	Non-probabilistic	• Coincidences • Equivalences

#### 4. Results

A general characterization of the 40 SE initiatives reviewed evidenced a remarkable gender leadership and managerial self-determination, with dedication not only to the attention of vulnerable or marginalized groups or the search for concrete solutions to improve the quality of life of communities, but also to the allocation of resources, efforts, and capital in solving social problems. Although there was a correspondence of the economic activities in which the SEs were enrolled concerning the most outstanding in previous research in the specific context of the city of Medellín, such as the environment, the Culture of Peace and Human Rights, education, and the orange economy [76,77], other economic sectors were also highlighted as innovative fields, including mental health, the use of artisanal fabrics, the reuse of clothing, gastronomy and the collection of animal excrement. Although the SEs had a trajectory of fewer than six years, they have been strengthening through their legal formalization in the recent period, in addition to the use of training and advisory opportunities provided by higher education institutions and self-financing based on the management of public policies and the trust generated from the bank.

From the Social Entrepreneurship category, the variables had a moderate association capacity. However, seven of the twelve proposals addressed the subcategories of the economic model of the SEs, their maturity, and their belonging to ecosystems, and were able to generate shared variability concerning those related to the development category (six correlations in total) and three for each of the other types, respectively (see Table 3). In this order, the entrepreneurs considered it convenient and effective dissemination of the portfolio of products and services to generate a risky bet that favored both the requirements of the market and the stakeholders that are part of the social process ( $D6, SE3, r_{D6,SE3}^2 = 0.2704$ ;  $D6, SE11, r_{D6,SE11}^2 = 0.2916$ ). In this task, strategic allies were identified for the development of profitable and environmentally friendly products ( $D13, SE3, r_{D13,SE3}^2 = 0.3481$ ), where the availability or management of resources before public and private entities was highlighted as an opportunity to turn the organization into an engine that helps the dynamization of the local economy ( $D10, SE11, r_{D10,SE11}^2 = 0.3481$ ); all this, hand in hand with the use of technology, which, combined with energizing strategies that facilitate and favor an organizational climate, motivates employees to develop creative and innovative products that impact the expectations of consumers ( $D2, SE2, r_{D2,SE2}^2 = 0.25$ ;  $D2, SE6,$

$r_{D2,SE6}^2 = 0.3721$ ). The initiatives addressed showed how products and services are created from a solidarity perspective (KMPs1, SE2,  $r_{KMPs1,SE2}^2 = 0.2704$ ), where efficiency in the use of shared resources is promoted (KMPs13, SE3,  $r_{KMPs13,SE3}^2 = 0.4356$ ); in addition to designing strategies to constantly enhance the different models and alternatives of value creation (KMPs6, SE5,  $r_{KMPs6,SE5}^2 = 0.2704$ ).

**Table 3.** Social Entrepreneurship relationship.

Category	Codification of Relations with Social Entrepreneurship (SE)	Shared Variability	Strength of Correlation	Aspects
Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs)	KMPs1, SE2	0.2704	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-creating new products and services</li> <li>Adopting social and solidarity benefits</li> </ul>
	KMPs6, SE5	0.2704	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-creating new products and services</li> <li>Organizational value creation</li> </ul>
	KMPs13, SE3	0.4356	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Searching for social benefits for consumers</li> <li>Sustainable, efficient and profitable business opportunities</li> </ul>
Organizational Aspects (OA)	OA5, SE3	0.3035	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder relationship</li> <li>Sustainable, efficient and profitable business opportunities</li> </ul>
	OA6, SE1	0.2916	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employee autonomy for developing activities</li> <li>Sustainable organizational management</li> </ul>
	OA7, SE7	0.3249	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defining of challenges to face the market</li> <li>Resource acquisition management</li> </ul>
Development (D)	D2, SE2	0.2500	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopting social and solidarity benefits</li> <li>Performance and motivation</li> </ul>
	D2, SE6	0.3721	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Performance and motivation</li> <li>Dynamic communication channels</li> </ul>
	D6, SE3	0.2704	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting external goals</li> <li>Sustainable, efficient and profitable business opportunities</li> </ul>
	D6, SE11	0.2916	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting external goals</li> <li>Social work diffusion</li> </ul>
	D10, SE11	0.3481	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attention to government regulations</li> <li>Social work diffusion</li> </ul>
	D13, SE3	0.3481	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental priority in organizational activities</li> <li>Sustainable, efficient and profitable business opportunities</li> </ul>

The SE grants autonomy to collaborators to implement tools that improve the exchange and management of information in resource planning and task development (OA6, SE1,  $r_{OA6,SE1}^2 = 0.2916$ ), acquire resources (OA7, SE7,  $r_{OA7,SE7}^2 = 0.3249$ ), and offer them visibility in the market (OA5, SE3,  $r_{OA5,SE3}^2 = 0.3035$ ). For their part, the entrepreneurs' narratives were mainly located in the subcategories of the economic model and the relationship with ecosystems. From the first, they pointed out the need to have a model of solidarity consumption, which would allow reinvestment of the profits in the same venture



and benefit other people; especially vulnerable populations that characterize Medellín, such as children, adolescents, female heads of families, people with disabilities, victims of the armed conflict, and unemployed young people. On the other hand, the skills acquired by the entrepreneurs and their life experiences, for the sake of finding the solution to social problems, allows relationships with other entrepreneurs to develop through networks that feed the ecosystem of the Innovation District, where they share, among others, affinities regarding the motivations that led them to work on their initiatives, thus establishing synergies: personal life situations, even experience outside the country, were considered as a starting point; the direct contact with borderline situations in personal matters, or with the reality resulting from market disparities, led them to exercise their abilities at the service of social interest and want to position their initiative more and more in the socio-economic environment. Although the existence of Public Policy is known, there is a lack of greater appropriation of it and the recognition of its operability based on the effective inclusion of all experiences in any activity generated by it. Entrepreneurs know that Public Policy goes through all their work, but there is no awareness about how it is made effective from their work and all its benefits.

The Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs) category indicated moderate and robust association capacity in 7 of the 16 established variables, the most outstanding being those related to value creation from social benefits, the co-creation of knowledge from the interrelationships of collaborators, and the combination of expertise to take advantage of innovation in favor of beneficiaries (see Table 4). The shared variability occurred mainly with other variables of the same category (ten in total) and the three already mentioned in the SE category. In this sense, the accessibility of information in the SE affects the constancy and availability of collaborators to generate solutions based on market demand (KMPs7, KMPs3,  $r_{KMPs7,KMPs3}^2 = 0.3249$ ). Thus, the use of information exchange mechanisms between stakeholders is required (KMPs6, KMPs3,  $r_{GC6,GC3}^2 = 0.3025$ ), counting on policies for their motivation and retention, with approaches to social realities, empathy, and collaborative design which favor their willingness to share and implement their knowledge (KMPs9, KMPs5,  $r_{KMPs9,KMPs5}^2 = 0.2809$ ; KMPs7, KMPs2,  $r_{KMPs7,KMPs2}^2 = 0.3600$ ). Based on this, it is possible to combine the individual expertise and the knowledge previously acquired by the collaborators with the requirements of the consumer to find solutions to social problems together (KMPs8, KMPs3,  $r_{KMPs8,KMPs3}^2 = 0.3136$ ; KMPs9, KMPs3,  $r_{KMPs9,KMPs3}^2 = 0.3600$ ; KMPs7, KMPs11,  $r_{KMPs11,KMPs3}^2 = 0.39699$ ; so that the results obtained allow a percentage of the financial profits to be used for the benefit of the community (KMPs13, KMPs14,  $r_{KMPs13,KMPs14}^2 = 0.3418$ ), without jeopardizing the financial sustainability of the SE (KMPs13, KMPs3,  $r_{KMPs13,KMPs3}^2 = 0.3136$ ).

The entrepreneurs' narratives also emphasized the creation of value from the understanding of social enterprise, which seeks to make a profit and transform the communities' reality. This is achieved by offering a specific product or service that its producers consider to be a social innovation in light of the Public Policy that the city has set. On the other hand, the co-creation and combination of knowledge were highlighted from the ongoing feedback that should be with the beneficiaries as external customers, along with collaboration with other businesses and the assistance of other experts who can help the SE do its job better.

From the Organizational Aspects category, 15 of the 16 variables showed moderate and robust association capacity, especially financing, planning, and the use of technologies (see Table 5). The shared variability occurred significantly with variables of the same category (fifteen in total), six with KMPs and three with SE. In this way, the SEs identify strategies and mechanisms for the acquisition of resources, marketing, personnel, and technologies that allow them to: face the demands of the market and competition (OA7, OA1,  $r_{OA7,OA1}^2 = 0.2601$ ); take advantage of the remnants of indebtedness, and increase profitability (OA2, OA1,  $r_{OA2,OA1}^2 = 0.4225$ ); ensure security in data handling and the adoption of sustainable practices (OA13, OA12,  $r_{OA13,OA12}^2 = 0.2704$ ; OA14, OA9,  $r_{OA14,OA9}^2 = 0.3481$ ; OA14, OA13,  $r_{OA14,OA13}^2 = 0.3844$ ); and achieve inter-institutional agreements both for the co-creation in the design of products and the offer

of financing sources to debtor clients (OA3, KMPs6,  $r_{OA3,KMPs6}^2 = 0.2916$ ; OA4, OA3,  $r_{OA4,OA3}^2 = 0.4096$ ).

**Table 4.** Knowledge Management relationship.

Category	Codification of Relations with Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs)	Shared Variability	Strength of Correlation	Aspects
Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs)	KMPs6, KMPs3	0.3025	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-creating new products and services</li> <li>Tools for improve information interchange</li> </ul>
	KMPs7, KMPs2	0.3600	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of employees for the development of activities</li> <li>Discipline integration for knowledge sharing</li> </ul>
	KMPs7, KMPs3	0.3249	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability of employees for the development of activities</li> <li>Tools to improve information interchange</li> </ul>
	KMPs8, KMPs3	0.3136	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflict resolution</li> <li>Tools to improve information interchange</li> </ul>
	KMPs9, KMPs3	0.3600	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulating old and new knowledge</li> <li>Tools to improve information interchange</li> </ul>
	KMPs9, KMPs5	0.2809	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulating old and new knowledge</li> <li>Employee motivation and retention policies</li> </ul>
	KMPs13, KMPs3	0.3136	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Searching for social benefits for consumers</li> <li>Tools to improve information interchange</li> </ul>
	KMPs13, KMPs14	0.3418	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Searching for social benefits for consumers</li> <li>Profit from occasional incomes</li> </ul>

**Table 5.** Organizational Aspects relationship.

Category	Codification of Relations with Organizational Aspects (OA)	Shared Variability	Strength of Correlation	Aspects
Social Entrepreneurship (SE)	OA6, SE1	0.2916	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employee autonomy for developing activities</li> <li>Sustainable organizational management</li> </ul>
Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs)	OA3, KMPs6,	0.2916	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Debt financing</li> <li>Co-creating new products and services</li> </ul>
	OA6, KMPs3	0.2500	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employee autonomy for developing activities</li> <li>Tools to improve information interchange</li> </ul>

Table 5. Cont.

Category	Codification of Relations with Organizational Aspects (OA)	Shared Variability	Strength of Correlation	Aspects
Organizational Aspects (OA)	OA2, OA1	0.4225	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Profit from occasional income</li> <li>Investment tools for marketing, human resources, and technological development</li> </ul>
	OA4, OA3	0.4096	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interinstitutional agreements for financing</li> <li>Co-creating new products and services</li> </ul>
	OA7, OA1	0.2601	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defining of challenges to face the market</li> <li>Investment tools for marketing, human resources, and technological development</li> </ul>
	OA8, OA2	0.2704	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Optimal organizational environment</li> <li>Profit from occasional income</li> </ul>
	OA9, OA8	0.3364	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market resources optimization</li> <li>Optimal organizational environment</li> </ul>
	OA13, OA12	0.2704	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data security and technological infrastructure</li> <li>Employee welfare infrastructure</li> </ul>
	OA14, OA9	0.4490	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technological development for adopting organizational sustainable practices</li> <li>Market resources optimization</li> </ul>
	OA14, OA13	0.3025	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technological development for adopting organizational sustainable practices</li> <li>Data security and technological infrastructure</li> </ul>
	OA15, OA5	0.3600	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information and communication technologies</li> <li>Stakeholders relationship</li> </ul>
	OA15, OA9	0.2601	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information and communication technologies</li> <li>Market resources optimization</li> </ul>
	OA15, OA14,	0.4490	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information and communication technologies</li> <li>Technological development for adopting organizational sustainable practices</li> </ul>
	OA16, OA14	0.3364	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Websites for product and service commercialization</li> <li>Technological development for adopting organizational sustainable practices</li> </ul>
	OA16, OA15	0.3025	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Websites for product and service commercialization</li> <li>Information and communication technologies</li> </ul>

All this is possible if it gives an optimal organizational climate that favors profitability and permanence in the market (OA8, OA2,  $r_{OA8,OA2}^2 = 0.2704$ ; OA9, OA8,  $r_{OA9,OA8}^2 = 0.3364$ ) that promotes the autonomy of employees in the implementation of tools to improve information management (OA6, SE1,  $r_{OA6,SE1}^2 = 0.2916$ ; OA6, KMPs3,  $r_{OA6,KMPs3}^2 = 0.25$ ), as is the case with technology, since it facilitates interaction, development and visibility in the environment (OA15, OA5,  $r_{OA15,OA5}^2 = 0.36$ ; OA15, OA9,  $r_{OA15,OA9}^2 = 0.2601$ ; OA15, OA14,  $r_{OA15,OA14}^2 = 0.4490$ ), especially through the website (OA16, OA14,  $r_{OA16,OA14}^2 = 0.3364$ ; OA16, OA15,  $r_{OA16,OA15}^2 = 0.3025$ ). In this same sense, the testimonies of the entrepreneurs highlighted the financing, planning, and use of technology. The most relevant was the pursuit of calls and competitions that promote access to new sources of economic resources which focus on projects, whether they have local,

national or international coverage, or are private, public, or mixed. This was supported, in order, by their resources, nearby environments, voluntary contributions, bank financing, and their pursuit of financial capital. The constant presentation of this type of space, sponsored by different actions from the city ecosystem, generates installed capacity to respond assertively to the same requirements and take advantage of qualification opportunities by the linked incubators and accelerators. These acquired competencies are exercised in organizations that have teams of stakeholders. However, they are not enough in the face of the division of functions, especially in terms of communication with customers and resource management, so self-management must be resorted to, social networks being a mechanism that has provided multiple solutions.

From the Development category, 10 of the 13 variables showed moderate and robust association capacity, particularly organizational development and the SDGs (see Table 6). The shared variability was given with eight variables of the same category, ten with OA, six with SE, and three with KMPs. Based on this, organizations should use tools that allow them to assess the complacency and the degree of acceptance of consumers ( $D4, OA8, r_{D4,OA8}^2 = 0.2916$ ;  $D4, D3, r_{D4,D3}^2 = 0.3364$ ), as is the case of the motivation of the collaborator in the performance of its activities as a recognition strategy in the market ( $D3, KMPs1, r_{D3,KMPs1}^2 = 0.3025$ ;  $D3, OA8, r_{D3,OA8}^2 = 0.4096$ ;  $D3, D2, r_{D3,D2}^2 = 0.2916$ ), in addition to the inclusion of technology as a differentiating element in the entire value chain ( $D1, OA13, r_{D1,OA13}^2 = 0.4489$ ;  $D1, OA14, r_{D1,OA14}^2 = 0.3481$ ;  $D1, OA15, r_{D1,OA15}^2 = 0.3481$ ;  $D1, OA16, r_{D1,OA16}^2 = 0.2601$ ). Likewise, the generation of products has to do with the commitment that organizations acquire when articulating their social function with the SDGs ( $D11, D6, r_{D11,D6}^2 = 0.5184$ ;  $D11, D7, r_{D11,D7}^2 = 0.2916$ ) and Local Development plans ( $D12, OA5, r_{D12,OA5}^2 = 0.2704$ ;  $D12, D7, r_{D12,D7}^2 = 0.3025$ ;  $D12, D11, r_{D12,D11}^2 = 0.3481$ ), which allows improvement in the living conditions of the communities from a comprehensive perspective: social, economic, and environmental ( $D3, OA8, r_{D13,OA8}^2 = 0.2809$ ;  $D13, OA12, r_{D13,OA12}^2 = 0.2704$ ;  $D13, D6, r_{D13,D6}^2 = 0.2601$ ).

The entrepreneurs' narratives highlighted organizational and social development and its relationship with the SDGs, the former from the customization of products and services in addition to its diversification on different fronts: sales, training beneficiaries, support for other nascent ventures, and creation of corporations. This specificity is supported by the use of life stories or associated situations with which it is intended to seek added value and validate the innovation offered, as in the case of the pandemic caused by COVID-19, which forced entrepreneurs to rethink strategies or create new initiatives in which different recipients of SE participated. The support for a solidarity economy model was related to social development and the existence of the SE Public Policy. This type of management provides a sense of both sorority among women, leaders or collaborators of the ventures, and fraternity among all entrepreneurs; those who, by providing various sectors with opportunities for the achievement of their life projects, obtain their emotional salary, which is fundamental in their motivations. The use of biodegradable materials, and the reuse or restoration of material commodities, even food, were emphasized as examples of sustainable development from the perspective of the SDGs, the SE's ecological consciousness, and their persuading customers.

**Table 6.** Development relationship.

Category	Codification of Relations with Development (D)	Shared Variability	Strength of Correlation	Aspects
Knowledge Management Practices (KMPs)	D3, KMPs1	0.3025	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tools for evaluating consumer satisfaction</li> <li>Co-development of products and services</li> </ul>

Table 6. Cont.

Category	Codification of Relations with Development (D)	Shared Variability	Strength of Correlation	Aspects
Organizational Aspects (OA)	D1, OA13	0.4489	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return on investment (ROI)</li> <li>Data security and technological infrastructure</li> </ul>
	D1, OA14	0.3481	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return on investment (ROI)</li> <li>Technological development for adopting sustainable practices</li> </ul>
	D1, OA15	0.3481	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return on investment (ROI)</li> <li>Information and communication technologies</li> <li>Stakeholder relationship</li> </ul>
	D1, OA16	0.2601	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return on investment (ROI)</li> <li>Websites for product and service commercialization</li> </ul>
	D3, OA8	0.4096	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tools for evaluating consumer satisfaction</li> <li>Optimal organizational environment</li> </ul>
	D13, OA12	0.2704	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable performance</li> <li>Employee welfare infrastructure</li> </ul>
Development (D)	D3, D2	0.2916	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tools for evaluating consumer satisfaction</li> <li>Performance and motivation</li> </ul>
	D4, D3	0.3364	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Success in product and service development</li> <li>Tools for evaluating consumer satisfaction</li> </ul>
	D11, D6	0.5784	Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulation with the 2030 Agenda</li> <li>Meeting external needs</li> </ul>
	D11, D7	0.2916	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulation with the 2030 Agenda</li> <li>Product and service development based on social needs</li> </ul>
	D12, D7	0.3025	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulating organizational goals with City Development Plan</li> <li>Product and service development based on social needs</li> </ul>
	D12, D11	0.3481	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulating organizational goals with City Development Plan</li> <li>Articulation with the 2030 Agenda</li> </ul>
	D13, D6	0.2601	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable performance</li> <li>Meeting external needs</li> </ul>

## 5. Discussion

The SE initiatives addressed are inserted into the entrepreneurship ecosystem of the city of Medellín, taking advantage of its opportunities to generate innovative value regarding the solution of social needs, in addition to achieving synergies that allow sustainability from networking, both local and global, and the search for resources. It is an exploration of differentiating niches of social marketing, even beyond the groupings proposed by previous

studies [8,9]. They indicate the dynamism typical of entrepreneurs and the active dissemination provided by the ecosystem; their same mood is in line with the trends evidenced in various international field experiences [78]. It establishes the starting and arrival point of the SE: satisfaction from altruism is the benchmark of the emotional salary of entrepreneurs. At the same time, financial sustainability is sought from the hybrid model that implies this type of organization.

The ecosystem's accomplishments and efforts to have the business model recognized legally in the city and country have led to knowledge management insights from the SE. This can be appreciated even more as the initiatives mature and contribute to the scope of the ecosystem's homeostasis. As such, a longer time in the market and sustainability with networking allows for good performance of each particular venture and strengthens the areas of recognition achieved from the ecosystem.

The SE is positioned as an organization where the KMPs show their increasingly strong value in the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, in which the City District operates. In this framework, the KMPs in the reviewed SE are understood holistically and articulate the four associated subcategories: knowledge transfer, knowledge co-creation, knowledge combination, and value creation; from significant aspects found such as organizational strategies, strategic direction, and communication channels mediated by ICT, they link tacit and explicit knowledge in the guarantee of appropriate development of products and services that create value for all stakeholders. Incorporating knowledge stock with dynamic organizational capabilities in the SE allows for facing the dynamic and changing variations of the markets and social needs [79]. Highlighting knowledge as a valuable resource, rare and difficult to imitate, significantly impacts organizational performance by considering intangible elements such as culture, reputation, and necessary trust in the relationships established between businesses, consumers, and communities [80].

The KMPs incorporate processes of knowledge creation, organization, dissemination, and use, and regulate knowledge processes that remedy existing needs [22], both from Medellín's ecosystem and, possibly, from other national and foreign ones. Faced with this, the organizational climate, the management of resources, the improvement of the product, and its commercialization motivate the desire of social entrepreneurs to generate effective strategies to stay in the market. All these factors validate the different KMPs used by the SEs, since, when evaluating the generation of sustainable social value shared by its members, they allow the SEs to make decisions conducive to becoming agents of change for the different economic sectors where they are [81].

In this sense, the KMPs, concerning what was conceived as SE, highlight the relevance of intangible resources as the motivation and retention of the collaborator to guarantee the appropriate attention to the requirements of vulnerable populations without putting at risk the financial stability of the organization [82]. In this sense, the experience acquired by the entrepreneurs in the various value chain processes becomes another intangible resource echoed in the ecosystem, to communicate life stories and meaningful experiences that serve not only as motivational factors but also as tacit knowledge that can be incorporated by other emerging filmmakers or assist in designing routes and strategies for the environment and entrepreneurship.

The hunt for resources, which operates in a way proportionate to the development of entrepreneurship and its acceptance within the ecosystem, stands out among these talents learned through the expertise of entrepreneurs. Access to local and global calls is more feasible for the initiatives with capital accumulated in this area, which is recognized as a source of income, given the support for this type of business, even from the private sector. Although the SEs focus on developing activities where financial performance is not predominant, the core is on generating solutions to problems of different social sectors that can generate profitability for entrepreneurs and stakeholders while responding to market disparities. In this way, SE can offer unique products and services whose development is supported by the management of intellectual capital (knowledge assets) and cooperation between the organization and stakeholders [83]. This behavior contributes to access to other



resources such as physical infrastructure, furniture, entrepreneurship ecosystems, diversification of funding sources, spaces for creativity, and sharing of meaningful experiences.

The KMPs improve the development of products and services by articulating organizational work with the communities and social functions of the social enterprise. However, this activity is not carried out in isolation. It requires the generation of trusting relationships with strategic allies that help to make visible the demands of the market and the benefits that the organization has to meet these demands. Under this perspective, developing products and services in SE includes a series of financial, organizational and social interests, which, by working together, improve the living conditions of communities [84]. This type of entrepreneurship faces high uncertainty in developing products and services derived from the structure of business models, the nature of consumers, and the market in which they operate [85]. In response to this, the filmmakers' inventiveness and tenacity were on display, allowing them to endure within the parameters of their goals as a catalyst for sustainability.

The KMPs can contribute to a greater extent to the generation of products and services that satisfy social needs on the part of entrepreneurs, to the time that there is a more significant appropriation of the Public Policy adopted in this matter by entrepreneurs and the ecosystem in general. This is merely a follow-up report on the city's observatory of the legislation's implementation of the SE. It shows a lack of conceptuality, even of what the SE is. Eight years after the policy was implemented, which covers the average time of creation and development of the SE participating in the study, there was no evidence of adequate knowledge of it and its opportunities. Although the city ecosystem is being strengthened with KMPs that help to structure the different SEs organizationally, a more active role of Public Policy could boost the achievements obtained—all from participatory evaluation and monitoring processes that allow SEs to be co-creators of new knowledge in entrepreneurship management as impacts achieved according to their own cycle of Public Policy [86]—in addition to continuing to promote the training and advisory processes for entrepreneurs, repeatedly highlighted by them, from a Triple Helix management model [87] that combines the local university and their business career with the District's purposes.

The field of knowledge in the construction of the SE finds in the revised KMPs a horizon of favorable understanding, while the organizational character is one of the approaches that characterize the epistemological approach to these practices in recent years. In this regard, the related experiences highlighted the importance of tacit and explicit knowledge management, given by entrepreneurial expertise. Typical of their work, as an engine of the generation of the economic and social value chain, it is, at the same time, the competitive advantage against the market, where it is committed to a solidarity economic model with attention to environmental care. The gender perspective contributes to this, not only as the target audience of the SE but also as a strength in the significant number of female leaders at the forefront of the experiences, which corresponds to similar studies [88,89]. The ecosystem's objectives give women a decisive role in post-pandemic economic reactivation [90]. Because of the ecosystem's strength and the difficulties arising from public policy, it is necessary to strengthen the entrepreneurship sector from synergistic proposals for the same KMPs raised. Numbers eight and nine should also be introduced in addition to number 17, as these aspects help determine the KMPs' influence on the SDGs.

## 6. Conclusions

SEs can be considered as emerging organizations that innovate in traditional business models by incorporating solidarity management actions to guarantee the creation of shared value among all stakeholders and improving the living conditions of communities. The context of the city of Medellín's Science, Technology, and Innovation District reaffirms how this type of organization has a dynamic role in the entrepreneurship ecosystems and the local business fabric, given its function as an articulating agent between the development of products and services, and the appropriate attention to social and market requirements. In addition, the intrinsic relationship between SE and the SDGs promotes economic growth

and industrialization, providing to a certain extent the resolution of the challenges of Medellín and the environments in the national and international development path, to reduce the rates of unemployment and poverty.

The topics addressed are novel compared to other organizational models, highlighting aspects such as the search for calls and sources of financing, gender focus, sorority, and generation of employment opportunities in highly vulnerable environments. In turn, the KMPs help by developing products and services in coordination with different stakeholders, where the intangible assets of intellectual capital acquire a leading role in providing appropriate solutions to the needs of the communities without putting at risk the financial stability of the organization.

In response to the purpose of the research, the KMPs from subcategories such as transfer, co-creation, combination, and value creation promote the relationship, trust, and exchange of tangible and intangible resources between SEs, consumers and other members of the entrepreneurship ecosystem. This type of behavior increases the differentiation of the products and services offered by optimizing organizational capabilities to permanently update the knowledge necessary to meet the social demands of the market. In this way, to guarantee appropriate knowledge management, it is essential to adopt communication mechanisms and tools between the parties involved, which digital platforms and technological tools can mediate. These communication elements facilitate interaction and make visible the role of SEs as organizations that transform the needs of communities, managing to differentiate themselves from their traditional competitors.

Technological factors drive the KMPs in SE for the generation of supply of goods and services that improve the quality of life in the communities. However, this process is not isolated and requires collaborative work between the different actors of the entrepreneurship ecosystem. In the city of Medellín, this is dynamic more as a consequence of the efforts of enterprises and their KMPs than state policy. However, it requires permanent participatory impact assessment processes that allow the ecosystem to be further enhanced, including the tacit and explicit knowledge generated. With this, a series of articulation strategies of different academic, business, and state actors are contributed to the field of SE study, which offers training and advice in incubation, empowerment, and sustainability of entrepreneurship.

The SEs from the KMPs become reference organizations in completing the SDGs by assuring respect for the environment, transforming, and building unique capacities in the areas where they operate. Sustainability in the SE articulately controls the economic, social, and environmental components. Additionally, multidisciplinary research determines social objectives, including many economic model typologies and fields of study pertinent to the circular economy, solidarity economy, and green economy.

In correspondence with the consulted literature, the SE can be understood based on the articulation between organization, knowledge management, and development aspects. This behavior is evidenced from the narratives of the entrepreneurs who revealed the need for strengthening the knowledge obtained (tacit or explicit) from actions that would allow them greater projection in the entrepreneurial ecosystem. However, this claim is still incipient from the Public Policy. In addition, entrepreneurs consider that value creation is reflected in obtaining social benefits. These benefits are present in economic sectors estimated by the Innovation District of the Aburrá Valley Metropolitan Area.

Difficulties related to the sample size may affect the management results of the Innovation District. In addition, the responses of SEs show shortcomings in the organizational structure and formalization. Both public and private organizations have databases of entrepreneurs and their work; however, they are not unified, systematized, and updated. This behavior limits access to information about the current state of SE.

Future research can contribute to strengthening information management processes regarding the SE. Likewise, it is recommended for future research to consider the relationship between SE maturity and local entrepreneurship ecosystems support. Finally, for future research, it is proposed to analyze the appropriation of Public Policy in the city;

highlighting the role of the KMPs in the management of the SE and their achievement of integral forms of development. Furthermore, future studies should include the issues of knowledge privacy and security in SE.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, N.M.-G., J.J.H.-P. and M.L.U.-M.; Methodology, N.M.-G. and J.J.H.-P.; Formal analysis, N.M.-G.; Writing—original draft, J.J.H.-P.; Writing—review & editing, N.M.-G.; Project administration, M.L.U.-M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research was funded by Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios—UNIMINUTO grant number 520-IN-1-20-012. And The APC was funded by Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios—UNIMINUTO.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data is unavailable due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## Appendix A. Survey

A series of statements will be presented below. you should rate each statement based on the following measurement scale: 5 (Completely agree), 4 (Somewhat agree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 2 (Somewhat Disagree) and 1 (Nothing in agreement).

Code	Statement	Category	Subcategory
SE1	The organization is managed based on guidelines for renewal of resources, and social, economic, and ecological conservation	Social entrepreneurship	Economic Model
SE2	The organization adopts principles that seek social benefits and solidarity with the associated workers beyond economic profitability		
SE3	The organization seeks business opportunities in resource use and environmental friendliness, while generating or supporting cost-effective and efficient products and services		
SE4	The organization is based on circular economy principles where all elements of production serve a continuous function and are reused at various times		
SE5	The organization recognizes its value creation processes and seeks to enhance them on an ongoing basis		
SE6	The different internal customers of the organization (executives, salespeople, and operators) are trained to dynamize the value chain		Entrepreneurial maturity
SE7	The organization has several strategies that allow the acquisition of resources and their investment		
SE8	The development of social entrepreneurship depends on the interaction between organizations, training processes, financing systems and legal framework		
SE9	The organization demands from the surrounding ecosystem or environment activities that promote and support innovation processes		Ecosystem
SE10	The organization is part of a network or association of entrepreneurs at the local, regional or national level		
SE11	The organization has developed initiatives to disseminate the work and social efforts that it has been carrying out		
SE12	Continuous training of internal customers is a necessary strategy for strengthening and projecting the work of the organization		

Code	Statement	Category	Subcategory
KMPs1	The organization actively participates with the consumer in the co-development of new products and services	Knowledge management practices	Knowledge transfer
KMPs2	The organization has strategies to integrate participants from different disciplines in order to share knowledge		
KMPs3	The organization implements tools to improve the exchange of information between stakeholders		
KMPs4	The organization has intellectual capital protection policies		
KMPs5	The organization has defined motivation and retention policies for outstanding employees in the creation/improvement of products and services		Knowledge co-creation
KMPs6	Co-creation supports the design of products and/or services to be offered		
KMPs7	I consider adequate the frequency and availability of employees to develop meetings focused on solving consumer problems		
KMPs8	The members of the organization combine their individual expertise to solve problems together		
KMPs9	In the organization there are tools that allow the articulation of old knowledge with new knowledge generated by employees		Knowledge combination
KMPs10	Seeking information from different internal and external sources helps to expand the organization's knowledge		
KMPs11	The organization has mechanisms that allow it to articulate the skills and experiences of its employees with the requirements of the consumer		
KMPs12	The organization has manuals, brochures or materials that determine the procedures that are developed in different areas of the organization		
KMPs13	The organization continuously creates social benefits for its consumers		Value creation
KMPs14	The organization uses a percentage of its financial profits to contribute to the solution of social problems		
KMPs15	The organization's operations generate wealth or profit for its shareholders and/or owners		
KMPs16	Government policies contribute to the creation of value in social entrepreneurship		
OA1	The organization establishes a roadmap for investment in marketing, human resources and technological developments	Organizational aspects	Sources of funding
OA2	The organization takes advantage of cash balances to avoid unnecessary indebtedness		
OA3	The organization provides its customers with third-party financing to grant them extensions on overdue debts		
OA4	The organization develops inter-institutional agreements with the financial sector to offer its clients credit and financing		
OA5	The organization establishes synergies with strategic partners to evaluate their performance in the development of new products or services		Planning processes
OA6	The organization grants autonomy to its employees in the planning of resources for the optimal development of their activities		
OA7	The organization identifies short- and medium-term challenges to meet market demands		
OA8	The organization defines organizational strategies to promote an optimal organizational environment among its employees		

Code	Statement	Category	Subcategory
OA9	The organization analyzes the competitors and the market to define competitive strategies that allow it to optimize its resources	Organizational aspects	Management of tangible and intangible resources
OA10	The organization establishes quality control techniques for tangible and intangible products to measure and monitor processes in progress		
OA11	The organization enhances the competencies and skills of its employees to develop new ideas that enable it to carry out its activities		
OA12	The organization has pleasant physical spaces for the well-being of its employees		
OA13	The organization has the technological infrastructure to ensure the security and management of its data		Incorporation of technologies
OA14	The organization identifies efficient technological developments oriented towards the adoption of sustainability practices		
OA15	The organization considers that ICT plays an important role in its development and interaction with the environment		
OA16	The organization has a website as a growth strategy to commercialize its products and/or services		
D1	The organization employs financial control tools that help it improve its return on investment	Development	Organizational development
D2	The organization's employees are motivated to perform their daily activities		
D3	The organization uses tools to assess consumer satisfaction		
D4	Compared to its competitors, the organization has a higher rate of success in launching new products or services		
D5	The organization provides autonomy to employees for the development of their functions		
D6	The organization aligns its business goals with social needs and requirements		Social development
D7	The organization identifies social needs to develop new products or services		
D8	The organization includes women and/or other minority person(s) as part of its work		
D9	The organization generates different opportunities for community participation to generate collective benefits.		
D10	The organization manages its resources in accordance with government regulations		Relationship with the 2030 Agenda
D11	The organization is aware of the Sustainable Development Goals and articulates its work with them		
D12	The organization relates its operations to the Development Plan of the municipality where it is located		
D13	Environment and sustainability are a priority in the organization's performance		

## Appendix B. Deep Interview Questions

Objective To Characterize Knowledge Management Strategies in Social Entrepreneurship Initiatives in the City of Medellín.		
Profile	Social Entrepreneurship Leaders	
No.	Statement	Category
1.	Why are you a social entrepreneur?	Social Entrepreneurship
2.	At what point in your life did you become a social entrepreneur?	Social Entrepreneurship
3.	What are the challenges you have had to take on with this work?	Organizational Aspects
4.	what does the social enterprise you lead do?	Organizational Aspects
5.	Who works with you and what do they do?	Organizational Aspects
6.	How are economic resources managed in social entrepreneurship?	Organizational Aspects
7.	How does the value chain of the product or service you offer work?	Knowledge Management Practices
8.	What knowledge is managed in social entrepreneurship and what is this process like?	Knowledge Management Practices
9.	How is the opinion of the organization's stakeholders taken into account?	Knowledge Management Practices
10.	How is knowledge managed in social entrepreneurship?	Knowledge Management Practices
11.	What contributions does this social enterprise make to the economy?	Development
12.	What opportunities does this social enterprise represent for the social sector?	Development
13.	How do you see entrepreneurship in the near future?	Development
14.	Do you have anything else to add?	Development

## References

- Žur, A. Entrepreneurial identity and social-business Tensions—The experience of social entrepreneurs. *J. Soc. Entrep.* **2020**, *12*, 438–461. [CrossRef]
- Martins, K.; Aveni, A. Impactos socio ambientais do empreendedor social. *Rev. Proc. Polít. Pub. Desenv. Soc.* **2020**, *2*, 57–73.
- Ruiz-Palomino, P.; Linuesa-Langreo, J.; Kelly, L. Hacia nuevos modelos empresariales más sociales y humanos: El papel de las mujeres en procesos de emprendimiento social y economía de comunión. *R. Emp. Hum.* **2019**, *22*, 87–122. [CrossRef]
- Jarrar, A. Entrepreneurship in Jordan: The eco-system of the Social Entrepreneurship Support Organizations (SESOs). *J. Innov. Entrep.* **2022**, *11*, 11. [CrossRef]
- Siqueira, E.H.; Bin, A.; Stefanuto, R.C. Measuring impacts of social enterprises: Perspectives from Brazilians entrepreneurs and investors. *Soc. Entrep. J.* **2021**, *17*, 527–547. [CrossRef]
- Nguyen, M.H.T.; Hodgetts, D.J.; Carr, S.C. Fitting Social Enterprise for Sustainable Development in Vietnam. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 10630. [CrossRef]
- Rivera, G.; Rivera, I. Design, measurement and analysis of a Knowledge Management model in the context of a Mexican University. *Rev. Innovar* **2016**, *26*, 21–34. [CrossRef]
- Bhardwaj, B. Role of Knowledge Management in Enhancing the Entrepreneurial Ecosystems Through Corporate Entrepreneurship and Strategic Intent in High-tech Firms. *J. Know. Econ.* **2019**, *10*, 1831–1859. [CrossRef]
- Wendo, D.R.; Rop, F.K.; Mwanzu, A.M. Knowledge Management for Innovativeness and Sustainable Organizational Development: A Case Study of Selected Corporate Institutions in Kenya. *Libr. Philos. Pract.* **2021**, 1–17. Available online: [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kibet-Felix/publication/350106490\\_Knowledge\\_Management\\_for\\_Innovativeness\\_and\\_Sustainable\\_Organizational\\_Development\\_A\\_Case\\_Study\\_of\\_Selected\\_Corporate\\_Institutions\\_in\\_Kenya/links/61b710454b318a6970da0990/Knowledge-Management-for-Innovativeness-and-Sustainable-Organizational-Development-A-Case-Study-of-Selected-Corporate-Institutions-in-Kenya.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Kibet-Felix/publication/350106490_Knowledge_Management_for_Innovativeness_and_Sustainable_Organizational_Development_A_Case_Study_of_Selected_Corporate_Institutions_in_Kenya/links/61b710454b318a6970da0990/Knowledge-Management-for-Innovativeness-and-Sustainable-Organizational-Development-A-Case-Study-of-Selected-Corporate-Institutions-in-Kenya.pdf) (accessed on 25 June 2023).
- Scuotto, V.; Le Loarne Lemaire, S.; Magni, D.; Maalaoui, A. Extending knowledge-based view: Future trends of corporate social entrepreneurship to fight the gig economy challenges. *J. Bus. Res.* **2022**, *139*, 1111–1122. [CrossRef]
- Lee, J.Y.; Choi, B.C.; Ghauri, P.N.; Park, B.I. Knowledge centralization and international R and D team performance: Unpacking the moderating roles of team-specific characteristics. *J. Bus. Res.* **2021**, *128*, 627–640. [CrossRef]
- Weerawardena, J.; Salunke, S.; Haigh, N.; Sullivan Mort, G. Business model innovation in social purpose organizations: Conceptualizing dual social-economic value creation. *J. Bus. Res.* **2021**, *125*, 762–771. [CrossRef]
- de Medellín, A. Plan de Desarrollo Medellín Futuro 2020–2023. 2020. Available online: [https://www.asocapitales.co/nueva/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Medellin\\_Plan-de-Desarrollo-Municipal\\_2020-2023.pdf](https://www.asocapitales.co/nueva/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Medellin_Plan-de-Desarrollo-Municipal_2020-2023.pdf) (accessed on 25 June 2023).



14. Lamy, C.; Aristizábal-Velásquez, M.E.; Obregón-Gómez, E.C.; Osorio-Atehortua, U.A. Case Study: How Medellín Is Creating a Hub for Impact Start-Ups. Studies on Entrepreneurship, Structural Change and Industrial Dynamics. In *Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship in the Fourth Sector*; Sánchez-Hernández, M., Carvalho, L., Conceição, R., Lucas, M., Noro, A., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2021; pp. 103–122.
15. Hota, P.K.; Subramanian, B.; Narayanamurthy, G. Mapping the intellectual structure of social entrepreneurship research: A Citation/Co-citation analysis. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2020**, *166*, 89–114. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
16. Ciambotti, G.; Sgrò, F.; Bontis, N.; Zaccone, M.C. Local relationships matter! The impact of intellectual capital on entrepreneurial bricolage in African social entrepreneurs. *Know. Proc. Manag.* **2021**, *28*, 321–330. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
17. Ricciardelli, A.; Borgonovi, E. Resilience and localism: Sustainable collaborative communities as organisation system. Matera 2019: A case study. *R. Internaz. Sci. Soc.* **2018**, *126*, 47–74.
18. Singh, P.; Joorel, J.P.S.; Solanki, H.; Kumar, A.; Trivedi, K. Ranking of Indian Research Intensive Higher Education Institutions Using Multiple Ranking Methodologies a Correlation Analysis. *J. Lib. Inform. Tech.* **2021**, *41*, 49–53. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
19. Godói-de-Sousa, E.; Machado, V. Social Enterprises in Brazil: Socially Produced Knowledge Versus Social Innovation. *J. Tech. Manag. Inn.* **2013**, *8*, 15. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Halberstadt, J.; Timm, J.-M.; Kraus, S.; Gundolf, K. Skills and knowledge management in higher education: How service learning can contribute to social entrepreneurial competence development. *J. Know. Manag.* **2019**, *23*, 1925–1948. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Lubberink, R.; Blok, V.; van Ophem, J.; van der Velde, G.; Omta, O. Innovation for Society: Towards a Typology of Developing Innovations by Social Entrepreneurs. *J. Soc. Entrep.* **2018**, *9*, 52–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Horng, J.-S.; Liu, C.-H.; Chou, S.-F.; Huang, Y.-C. The roles of university education in promoting students' passion for learning, knowledge management and entrepreneurialism. *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.* **2020**, *44*, 162–170. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Gupta, P.; Chauhan, S.; Paul, J.; Jaiswal, M.P. Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda. *J. Bus. Res.* **2020**, *113*, 209–229. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Bansal, S.; Garg, I.; Sharma, G.D. Social entrepreneurship as a path for social change and driver of sustainable development: A systematic review and research agenda. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 1091. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Abebe, M.A.; Kimakwa, S.; Redd, T. Toward a typology of social entrepreneurs: The interplay between passionate activism and entrepreneurial expertise. *J. Small Bus. Enter. Dev.* **2020**, *27*, 509–530. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Smitskikh, K.V.; Titova, N.Y.; Shumik, E.G. The model of social entrepreneurship dynamic development in circular economy. *R. Univ. Soc.* **2020**, *12*, 248–253.
27. Agarwal, B. Labouring for livelihoods: Gender, productivity and collectivity. *Ind. J. Lab. Econ.* **2020**, *63*, 21–37. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Jayasinghe, R.; Liyanage, N.; Baillie, C. Sustainable waste management through eco-entrepreneurship: An empirical study of waste upcycling eco-enterprises in sri lanka. *J. Mat. Cycles Waste Manag.* **2021**, *23*, 557–565. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Maalaoui, A.; Le Loarne-Lemaire, S.; Razgallah, M. Does knowledge management explain the poor growth of social enterprises? Key insights from a systematic literature review on knowledge management and social entrepreneurship. *J. Know. Manag.* **2020**, *24*, 1513–1532. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
30. Musiolik, J.; Markard, J.; Hekkert, M.; Furrer, B. Creating innovation systems: How resource constellations affect the strategies of system builders. *Tech. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2020**, *153*, 119209. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Hendriani, S.; Efni, Y.; Tiyasiningsih, E. The effect of knowledge, entrepreneurship motives and the society's culture in increasing the women micro business performance in Riau province. *Inter. J. Law Manag.* **2019**, *61*, 563–574. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Ortega, J.A.T. Ecosistemas para el emprendimiento: Características del concepto y su aplicación a la Empresa Social. *GIZAEKOA R. Vasc. Econ. Soc.* **2017**, *14*, 61–76.
33. García-Alonso, R.; Thoene, U.; Figueroa, A.M.; Murillo Amaris, E. El Emprendimiento Social en el marco de la Alianza del Pacífico. *Revesco R. Est. Coop.* **2020**, *133*, e67341. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Jones, P.; Ratten, V. Knowledge spillovers and entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Know. Manag. Res. Pract.* **2021**, *19*, 1–7. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Guerrero, M.; Santamaría-Velasco, C.A. Ecosistema y actividad emprendedora en México: Un análisis exploratorio. *Perf. Latin.* **2020**, *28*, 227–251. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Cuello-Coll, R.D.J. Factores que Inciden en el Desempeño de Emprendimientos Sociales en Colombia: Estudio Comparativo. Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad de la Costa, Barranquilla, Colombia, 2019.
37. Šumak, B.; Heričko, M.; Pušnik, M. Evaluation of XML Schema Support in Knowledge Management. In *Information Modelling and Knowledge Bases XXXII*; IOS Press: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2020; Volume 32, pp. 150–160.
38. Kordab, M.; Raudeliūnienė, J.; Meidutė-Kavaliauskienė, I. Mediating role of knowledge management in the relationship between organizational learning and sustainable organizational performance. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 10061. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Hsieh, P.J.; Lin, C.; Chang, S. The evolution of knowledge navigator model: The construction and application of KNM 2.0. *Exp. Syst. Appl.* **2020**, *148*, 113209. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Anggraini, F.; Abdul-Hamid, M.A.; Azlina, M.K.A. The role of intellectual capital on public universities performance in Indonesia. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. Humanit.* **2018**, *26*, 2453–2472.
41. Kar, S.K.; Padhi, S.K.; Samantarai, M. Disruptive Innovation and Economic Value Creation: A Service Sector Perspective. *Prabandhan Ind. J. Manag.* **2016**, *9*, 11–25. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
42. Xie, L.; Guan, X.; Cheng, Q.; Huan, T.C. Using customer knowledge for service innovation in travel agency industry. *J. Hospital. Tour. Manag.* **2020**, *45*, 113–123. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

43. Popescu, F. International Entrepreneurship: “Glocal” Business Creation, Development and Sustainable Employability. In *Advances in Human Factors, Business Management and Leadership*; Kantola, J.L., Nazir, S., Salminen, V., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2020; pp. 414–420.
44. Zhang, Y.; Zhang, M.; Luo, N.; Wang, Y.; Niu, T. Understanding the formation mechanism of high-quality knowledge in social question and answer communities: A knowledge co-creation perspective. *Intern. J. Inform. Manag.* **2019**, *48*, 72–84. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Audretsch, D.B.; Belitski, M.; Caiazza, R.; Lehmann, E.E. Knowledge management and entrepreneurship. *Inter. Entrep. Manag. J.* **2020**, *16*, 373–385. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Nonaka, L.; Takeuchi, H.; Umemoto, K. A theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Intern. J. Tech. Manag.* **1996**, *11*, 833–845.
47. Li, Y.-Q.; Liu, C.H.S. The role of problem identification and intellectual capital in the management of hotels’ competitive advantage—an integrated framework. *Inter. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2018**, *75*, 160–170. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Lieberman, M.B.; Balasubramanian, N.; Garcia-Castro, R. Toward a dynamic notion of value creation and appropriation in firms: The concept and measurement of economic gain. *Strat. Manag. J.* **2018**, *39*, 1546–1572. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Klein, S.; Schneider, S.; Spieth, P. How to stay on the road? A business model perspective on mission drift in social purpose organizations. *J. Busin. Res.* **2021**, *125*, 658–671. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Angelino, A.; Tassinari, M.; Barbieri, E.; Di Tommaso, M.R. Institutional and economic transition in Vietnam: Analysing the heterogeneity in firms’ perceptions of business environment constraints. *Compet. Chang.* **2021**, *25*, 52–72. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
51. Rachmawati, R. Research of the Impact of Financial Dimensions and Entrepreneurial Capacity on Business Performance in Small and Medium Enterprises in Central Java. *Univ. J. Accoun. Fin.* **2021**, *9*, 122–129. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Alhawari, O.; Awan, U.; Bhutta, M.K.S.; Ülkü, M.A. Insights from Circular Economy Literature: A Review of Extant Definitions and Unravelling Paths to Future Research. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 859. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Ko, W.W.; Liu, G. The transformation of traditional non-profit organizations into social enterprises: An institutional entrepreneurship perspective. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2021**, *171*, 15–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Parekh, N.; Attuel-Mendès, L. Social entrepreneurship finance: The gaps in an innovative discipline. *Intern. J. Entrep. Behav. Res.* **2021**, *28*, 83–108. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
55. Karpenko, O.A.; Zolkin, A.L.; Ryabkova, G.I.; Gurianov, P.A. Formation and Development of Intellectual and Social Institution of Civil Society on the Example of Creation and Implementation of Social Projects. *Sm. Inn. Syst. Tech.* **2022**, *275*, 767–774.
56. Barney, J. Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. *J. Manag.* **1991**, *17*, 99–120. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
57. Hagen, D.; Risselada, A.; Spierings, B.; Weltevreden, J.W.J.; Atzema, O. Digital marketing activities by Dutch place management partnerships: A resource-based view. *Cities* **2022**, *123*, 103548. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Khattak, M.S.; Ullah, R. The role of entrepreneurial orientation in tangible and intangible resource acquisition and new venture growth. *Manag. Decis. Econ.* **2021**, *42*, 1619–1637. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Sun, S.; Zheng, X.; Villalba-Díez, J.; Ordieres-Meré, J. Data handling in industry 4.0: Interoperability based on distributed ledger technology. *Sensors* **2020**, *20*, 3046. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Ibáñez, M.J.; Guerrero, M.; Yáñez-Valdés, C.; Barros-Celume, S. Digital social entrepreneurship: The N-Helix response to stakeholders’ COVID-19 needs. *J. Tech. Trans.* **2022**, *47*, 556–579. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Awan, U.; Khattak, A.; Rabbani, S.; Dhir, A. Buyer-Driven Knowledge Transfer Activities to Enhance Organizational Sustainability of Suppliers. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 2993. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Alashwal, A.M.; Low, W.W.; Kamis, N.A.M. Effect of Inter-Organizational Learning on Construction SMEs Performance. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*; IOP Publishing: Bristol, UK, 2019; Volume 495, p. 012043.
63. Ibidunni, A.S.; Kolawole, A.I.; Olokundun, M.A.; Ogbari, M.E. Knowledge transfer and innovation performance of small and medium enterprises (SMEs): An informal economy analysis. *Heliyon* **2020**, *6*, e04740. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
64. Anning-Dorson, T.; Odoom, R.K.; Acheampong, G.; Tweneboah-Koduah, E. Innovation and organizational development: The role of organizational leadership. *Afr. J. Econ. Manag. Stud.* **2017**, *8*, 338–351. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Mongelli, L.; Rullani, F. Inequality and marginalisation: Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and business model innovation. *Ind. Inn.* **2017**, *24*, 446–467. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
66. Abbate, T.; Codini, A.P.; Aquilani, B. Knowledge co-creation in Open Innovation Digital Platforms: Processes, tools and services. *J. Bus. Ind. Mark.* **2019**, *34*, 1434–1447. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Blagoycheva, H. Social Enterprises’ Position in Regional Sustainable Development. *Trak. J. Sci.* **2019**, *17*, 488–495. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. Deng, W.; Liang, Q.; Fan, P.; Cui, L. Social entrepreneurship and well-being: The configurational impact of institutions and social capital. *Asia Pac. J. Manag.* **2020**, *37*, 1013–1037. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
69. Littlewood, D.; Holt, D. How social enterprises can contribute to the sustainable development goals (SDGs). A conceptual framework. In *Entrepreneurship and the Sustainable Development Goals. Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research*; Apostolopoulos, N., Al-Dajani, H., Holt, D., Jones, P., Newbery, R., Eds.; Emerald: Bingley, UK, 2018; Volume 8, pp. 33–46.
70. Lee, S. Role of social and solidarity economy in localizing the sustainable development goals. *Intern. J. Sustain. Dev. World Ecol.* **2020**, *27*, 65–71. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
71. Marulanda-Grisales, N.; Pulgarín, J.J.H.; Marín, M.L.U.; Gómez, A.L.G. La gestión del conocimiento en emprendimientos sociales: Un análisis bibliométrico y cuantitativo de tendencias. *Rev. Univ. Y Empresa* **2022**, *24*, 1–35. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

72. Cesar da Silva, P.; Cardoso de Oliveira Neto, G.; Ferreira Correia, J.M.; Pujol Tucci, H.N. Evaluation of economic, environmental and operational performance of the adoption of cleaner production: Survey in large textile industries. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2021**, *278*, 123855. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
73. Wang, Y.; Chen, Y.; Lin, W.; Huang, M.; Xu, Y.; Chen, G. Inflammatory markers in children with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome. *Front. Pediatr.* **2023**, *11*, 1134678. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. Makandwa, G.; de Klerk, S.; Saayman, A. Culturally-based community tourism ventures in southern Africa and rural women entrepreneurs' skills. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2023**, *26*, 1268–1281. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
75. Moscoso, J.N. Mixed methods in education research: Towards a reflexive use. Les méthodes mixtes en recherche en éducation: Vers une utilisation réflexive; Os métodos mistos na pesquisa em educação: Rumo a um uso reflexivo; Los métodos mixtos en la investigación en educación: Hacia un uso reflexivo. *Cad. Pesqui.* **2017**, *47*, 632–649.
76. Intindola, M.L.; Pittz, T.G.; Rogers, S.E.; Weisinger, J.Y. Partner Selection in Social Entrepreneurship Collectives: How Team Selection Control Can Enhance Satisfaction in Cross-Sector Social Partnerships. *J. Soc. Entrep.* **2020**, *11*, 343–368. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Satar, M.S. Analysing the differences in the importance of social entrepreneurship critical success factors across social enterprise demographics. *Intern. J. Entrep. Small Bus.* **2020**, *41*, 562–583. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
78. Spicer, J.; Kay, T. Another organization is possible: New directions in research on alternative enterprise. *Soc. Compass.* **2022**, *16*, e12963. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
79. Forliano, C.; Ferraris, A.; Bivona, E.; Couturier, J. Pouring new wine into old bottles: A dynamic perspective of the interplay among environmental dynamism, capabilities development, and performance. *J. Bus. Res.* **2022**, *142*, 448–463. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
80. Gubbins, C.; Dooley, L. Delineating the tacit knowledge-seeking phase of knowledge sharing: The influence of relational social capital components. *Hum. Res. Dev. Quar.* **2021**, *32*, 319–348. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
81. Cannatelli, B.; Smith, B.; Giudici, A.; Jones, J.; Conger, M. An Expanded Model of Distributed Leadership in Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Long Ran. Plan.* **2017**, *50*, 582–602. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
82. Sydow, A.; Cannatelli, B.L.; Giudici, A.; Molteni, M. Entrepreneurial Workaround Practices in Severe Institutional Voids: Evidence from Kenya. *Entrep. Theor. Pract.* **2022**, *46*, 331–367. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
83. Otolá, I.; Grabowska, M.; Kozak, M. What constitutes the value in business model for social enterprises? *Pol. J. Manag. Stud.* **2021**, *24*, 336–353. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
84. Valenzuela-García, H.; Molina, J.L.; Lubbers, M.J.; Escribano, P.; Fuentes, S. Emprendimiento Social. Autoempleo y extracción del valor en la era post-crisis. *R. Antrop. Soc.* **2019**, *28*, 371–390. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
85. Carroll, R.; Casselman, R.M. The Lean Discovery Process: The case of raiserve. *J. Small Bus. Enterp. Dev.* **2019**, *26*, 765–782. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
86. Bentancur, N.; Bidegain, G.; Martínez, R. Public policy training in latin america: Current status and challenges for political science. *Iconos* **2021**, *1*, 13–36.
87. Cai, Y. Neo-triple helix model of innovation ecosystems: Integrating triple, quadruple and quintuple helix models. *Tri. Hel.* **2022**, *1*, 1–31. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
88. Osunmuyiwa, O.O.; Ahlborg, H. Stimulating competition, diversification, or re-enforcing entrepreneurial barriers? Exploring small-scale electricity systems and gender-inclusive entrepreneurship. *Ener. Res. Soc. Sci.* **2022**, *89*, 102566. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
89. Pineda Duque, J.A.; Castiblanco Moreno, S.E. Informal entrepreneurship and women's empowerment—The case of street vendors in urban colombia. *Intern. J. Gend. Entrep.* **2022**, *14*, 188–212. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
90. Kalbarczyk, A.; Harrison, M.; Chung, E.; Glass, N.; Genberg, B.; Decker, M.R.; Manabe, Y.C. Supporting Women's leadership development in global health through virtual events and near-peer networking. *Ann. Glob. Health* **2022**, *88*, 2. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.